

DEC - 5 2008

Mr. Dick Sauber, Esq. Robbins Russell 1801 K Street, NW, Suite 411L Washington, D.C. 20006

Re: MUR 6074

Dear Mr. Sauber:

On October 23, 2007, you notified the Commission that four employees of Edwards and Kelcey, Inc. ("EK"), a corporation acquired by Jacobs Engineering, your client, made contributions to various federal political and candidate committees from 2003-2006, which were then reimbursed by EK. On September 11, 2008, the Commission, after considering all the information you provided, determined to dismiss the allegation that Jacobs Engineering Group/Edwards and Kelcey, Inc. violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 441b(a) and 441f.

Nevertheless, Jacobs Engineering Group/Edwards and Kelcey, Inc. should be aware that violations of 2 U.S.C. §§ 441b(a) and 441f for making impermissible contributions have resulted in admonishment from the Commission. Jacobs Engineering Group/Edwards and Kelcey should take steps to ensure that this activity does not occur in the future.

The Commission closed its file in this matter. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which formed a basis for the Commission's determination, is attached for your information.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003).

The Commission will contact the political committees involved in this matter regarding the impermissible contributions. Based on my conversation with you, we will inform the committees that your client has waived its right to a refund and agreed to instruct the recipient committees to disgorge the contributions to the U.S. Treasury.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

April J. Sands
Attorney

Attachment

Factual and Legal Analysis

contributions:

2	FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION				
3	FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS				
<b>4</b> 5	MUR 6074				
6 7 8 9	RESPONDENT: Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc./Edwards and Kelcey, Inc.				
10 11	Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. ("Jacobs") reports that four				
12	employees of Edwards and Kelcey, Inc. ("EK"), a corporation it recently acquired, made				
13	contributions to various federal political and candidate committees from 2003-2006, which were				
14	then reimbursed by EK in violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended				
15	(the "Act").				
16	I. <u>FACTUAL BACKGROUND</u>				
17	Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. is a publicly traded corporation that describes itself as a				
18	broad-based technical professional consulting firm. In early 2007, Jacobs was engaged in				
19	discussions to acquire Edwards and Kelcey, Inc., a privately held engineering services firm. As				
20	part of its due diligence, Jacobs discovered that EK had apparently reimbursed employees for				
<b>2</b> 1	federal political contributions in violation of the Act. The transaction to purchase EK by Jacobs				
22	was completed on April 11, 2007.				
23	Following the discovery of the reimbursed contributions, EK asked its outside				
24	accountants, WISS & Company LLP ("WISS") to perform an audit of certain EK records. WISS				
25	identified the following six contributions totaling \$1,800 made by four EK employees for which				
26	those employees submitted EK Expense Reimbursement Forms requesting reimbursement for th				

CONTRIBUTOR	JOB TITLE	DATE	AMOUNT	RECIPIENT
Carrino, Dominic B	Engineer	03/21/04	\$300	Pascrell, Jr. for Congress
Carrino, Dominic B	Engineer	05/13/05	\$250	Kennedy for Senate
Carrino, Dominic	Engineer	06/30/04	\$500	DSCC
Fish, David	Consultant	10/26/05	\$250	Gilchrest for Congress
Marshall, Kenneth	Engineer	10/29/06	\$250	Elijah Cummings
McMahon, Brian	Engineer	05/17/03	\$250	Sweeney for Congress
TOTAL	<del> </del>		\$1,800.00	

There does not appear to be any evidence that the employees attempted to hide or conceal the reason for the reimbursements.

Given evidence of other political contributions made by EK employees obtainable through the Commission database, we asked Jacobs to determine if forty additional contributions were improperly reimbursed. EK Expense Reimbursement Forms were reviewed for the relevant time periods to determine if reimbursements had been either requested or received. No additional reimbursements were found. Counsel for Jacobs interviewed the EK employees still employed by EK who received the impermissible reimbursements and current EK employees "with any knowledge of the events in question." Counsel also reviewed the WISS audit reports and interviewed the auditor responsible for their preparation. It is Jacob's conclusion that the six EK corporate reimbursements acknowledged "were made through administrative sloppiness, lack off [sic] training, and lack of EK corporate guidelines."

According to its submission, Jacobs has taken steps to ensure that recently acquired EK employees, and other Jacobs employees, are educated in the applicable election laws. For example, each year Jacobs requires its employees, including EK employees, to reaffirm in writing that they understand and will comply with the Jacobs Business Conduct Policy, which

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- 1 includes a section explaining the laws regarding political contributions. This reaffirmation last
- 2 took place in September 2007. Jacobs also now requires that all employee expense reports be
- 3 submitted electronically to an audit team that follows written guidelines for reimbursement that
- 4 include instructions not to reimburse political contributions.

Furthermore, the individual who was improperly reimbursed and is still employed by EK

6 has been instructed to reimburse the company for the amount involved. Neither Jacobs nor EK

have contacted the political committees to inform them of the impermissible contributions, and

we have no information suggesting that the political committees are aware that the received

contributions were reimbursed.

## II. ANALYSIS

EK appears to have violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 441b(a) and 441f by making impermissible contributions from 2003 to 2006 in the names of others. The Act defines "contribution" as anything of value made by any person for the purpose of influencing any election for federal office. 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i). Under the Act, corporations are prohibited from making contributions or expenditures from their general treasury funds in connection with any election of any candidate for federal office and corporate officers are prohibited from consenting to such contributions. 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a). The Act also provides that no person shall make a contribution in the name of another person or knowingly permit his or her name to be used to effect such a contribution, and that no person shall knowingly accept a contribution made by one person in the name of another person. 2 U.S.C. § 441f.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

## MUR 6074 Factual and Legal Analysis

Jacobs acknowledges that the reimbursement by EK of contributions made by employees appears to be a violation of the Act. While the Commission could make reason to believe findings and seek civil penalties from both EK (now a subsidiary of Jacobs) and the four individual contributors, there are reasons not to pursue this matter. It appears that all reimbursed contributions have been disclosed and that Jacobs/EK has engaged in sufficient subsequent remedial measures to ensure this type of activity does not recur. Given the contributors' lack of sophistication with the Act, their lack of an attempt to disguise the contributions and requests for reimbursements, and the amounts involved, the most prudent course of action and the most efficient use of the Commission's resources is for the Commission to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and dismiss this matter with admonishments to Jacobs/EK and the four employees pursuant to Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985). The federal political committees that received contributions from EK employees between 2003 and 2006 have not been notified of their receipt of impermissible contributions. Under the Act, no person, including a political committee or a candidate, may knowingly accept or receive a corporate contribution. 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a). At this time, there is no information that any of the political committees had any knowledge that the contributions they received from the EK employees were made with corporate funds. Accordingly, we make no findings regarding the recipient committees.